DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 456 SP 021 131

TITLE Physical Education Mandates: A Preliminary Report.
INSTITUTION Illinois State Board of Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE Feb 82
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; Educational Legislation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Physical Education; Physical Fitness; *Program Effectiveness; Program Improvement; State Boards of Education; *State Standards; Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

This report provides analysis and preliminary recommendations on a mandate that requires and contributes to the development of physical education components in Illinois public schools. The report is presented in sections dealing with: (1) five areas of analysis and sources of information; (2) legal requirements and statutory authority for providing physical education; (3) legislative history of the physical education mandate; (4) status of the current physical education program; (5) an analysis of five areas of study; and (6) preliminary recommendations, conclusions, and summary of the development of a state physical education program. Discussion of the five areas of analysis centers on the narrow interpretation of the mandate in school districts and on the need to redefine the mandate to include more realistic requirements. The summary and conclusions state the reasons that the current mandate is not viable and reasons that physical education programs are needed in Illinois. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222456

SP

PHYSICAL EDUCATION MANDATES:

A PRELIMINARY REPORT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 021 131

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer
Printed by the Authority of the State of Illinois
February 1982 2-743-67 No. 303

PHYSICAL EDUCATION MANDATE: A PRELIMINARY REPORT

ILLINOIS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Edward Copeland, Chairman
State Board of Education

Donald G. Gill
State Superintendent of Education

Springfield, Illinois

February 1982

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. METHODOLOGY	1
III. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS Statutory Authority State Board of Education Regulations	3
IV. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY State Law Federal Law Attempts to Revise the Physical Education Mandate	5
V. THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM	7
VI. ANALYSIS OF ISSUES	10
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	14
VIII. PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS	15
REFERENCES	17

PHYSICAL EDUCATION MANDATE: A PRELIMINARY REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

In September 1981, the Illinois State Board of Education adopted, and directed State Superintendent Donald G. Gill to implement, a plan for the careful and deliberative study of the mandates for elementary and secondary education in the State. The plan adopted by the Board called for three phases of study; the following report on the Physical Education mandate is one of the five reports to be considered during Phase I. The others address special education, curriculum, driver education and bilingual education mandates.

This report provides the staff analysis and preliminary recommendations regarding the mandate requiring and shaping physical education in the State. It is presented in sections dealing with the methodology for the study, the legal requirements (including the Illinois historical and legislative background), the current instructional program status, the staff analysis of issues, summary and conclusions, and preliminary recommendations for action by the State Board of Education. Following a period of public comment and Board discussion, final recommendations will be presented by the State Superintendent to the State Board of Education's Planning and Policy Committee for consideration and later submission to the full Board.

II. METHODOLOGY

The study plan approved by the State Board of Education directed staff to apply the following questions in the analysis of the mandates:

1. What desirable condition or outcome is called for by the mandate?

   An essential step in determining the necessity of a requirement is being able to determine that it is purposeful, seeks to improve an existing condition, or creates a new and desirable condition. A mandate should be clearly directed towards an end which is stated in such a manner that its achievement can be reasonably assessed.

2. Is there evidence that in the absence of the mandate the condition or outcome will not be achieved?

   In this context, evidence may consist primarily of historical or trend data or comparisons with other states in order to determine the likelihood of success in the absence of the requirement. One major factor for consideration could be the amount of time available for implementation. That is, whether the condition needs to be met by a certain date or whether it is of such a nature that time is not the driving factor.

3. As presently defined does (can) the mandate yield the desired result?

   While measuring results may be a relatively straightforward proposition, the more complex but necessary task of determining -- or attributing -- cause/effect must also be undertaken. The need is to be reasonably assured that it is the mandate which yields the desired result and not other uncontrolled factors.

4. Could the mandate be defined and/or implemented differently and yield the desired result?

   The nature of the mandate and any required administrative mechanisms should be consistent with the most current and accepted research and professional experience. Regulations should be as simple and direct as possible and allow for efficient and effective use of resources.

5. Does the mandate reflect a compelling state interest?

   The State's interest in mandates can be based on such principles as equality, equity, efficiency, compliance with higher authority or health and safety. There can also be compelling interests that reflect the State's values in terms of required activities, experiences or settings. The maintaining or establishing of mandates should be tied directly to an identifiable need of the state to cause the required activity.

A substantial amount of information was compiled by staff in the effort to conduct an objective analysis of the mandate. Among the sources used were:

1. Current statutes, regulations and prior State Board of Education action
2. Legislative proposals
3. Materials regarding the instructional program and service delivery
4. Policies adopted by other states
5. Testimony of professional organizations and advisory committees
6. Historical background material
7. Medical testimony and other pertinent research

In the literature there is evidence that physical exercise contributes to physical fitness, well-being and good health. However, staff was not able to find evidence that conclusively linked school programs to physical fitness improvement; neither did the evidence eliminate the possibility of such a link.

One characteristic of materials relating to the value of physical education in school curricula is that the weight of evidence is far more subjective than objective. Both data and testimony tend to stem more from perceived values than from quantifiable relationships beween programs and results.

Additionally, the present monitoring and program evaluation practices do not afford - at either state or local levels - an accurate description of the elementary and secondary physical education programs in Illinois. Staff was able to identify some patterns and trends which are summarized in this report.

III. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

Statutory Authority

Current statutory authority for physical education, enacted in 1957, is located in Sections 27-5 through 27-9 of The School Code of Illinois. Section 27-5 states that school boards of public schools and the Board of Governors of state colleges and universities shall provide physical education training. Section 27-9 requires all state universities to provide courses in methods and materials of physical education and training for teachers. The basic physical education mandate, stated in Section 27-6, prescribes daily classes of physical education for all students K-12.

Section 27-6. Courses in physical education - Special activities

> Pupils enrolled in the public schools and state universities engaged in preparing teachers shall, as soon as practicable, be required to engage daily, during the school day, in courses of physical education for such periods as are compatible with the optimum growth and development needs of individuals at the various age levels.
>
> Special activities in physical education, or a modified course thereof, shall be provided for pupils whose physical or emotional condition, as determined by the examination provided for in Section 27-8, prevents their participation in the courses provided for normal children. Amended by P.A. 78-0334, effective October 1, 1973.

Another provision includes the purposes of courses in physical education and training and cites State Board of Education responsibility:

Section 27-7. Purposes of courses in physical education and training - Courses of Instruction

> Courses in physical education and training shall be for the following purposes:
>
> 1. to develop organic vigor;
> 2. to provide bodily and emotional poise;

3. to provide neuro-muscular training;
4. to prevent or correct certain postural defects;
5. to develop strength and endurance;
6. to develop desirable moral and social qualities;
7. to promote hygenic school and home life; and
8. to secure scientific supervision of the sanitation and safety of school buildings, playgrounds, athletic fields and equipment thereof.

The State Board of Education shall prepare and make available courses of instruction in physical education and training that may be used as guides for the various grades and types of schools in order to make effective the purposes set forth in this section and the requirements provided in Section 27-6, and shall see that the general provisions and intent of Sections 27-5 to 27-9, inclusive, are enforced. Amended by P.A. 81-1508, effective September 25, 1980.

State Board of Education Regulations

The statutory requirements are elaborated by regulations found in The Illinois Program for Evaluation, Supervision, and Recognition of Schools, State Board of Education, Document Number 1. Section 4-2.20 states:

a. Appropriate activity related to physical education shall be required of all students each day. The time schedule shall compare favorably with other courses in the curriculum. Safety education as it relates to the physical education program should be incorporated.

b. There shall be a definite school policy regarding credit earned each semester in physical education with provisions for allowable variables in special cases.

c. If a district determines that it is difficult to implement a program of physical education which involves students daily, the administration should consult one of the program service personnel from the IOE (sic) for assistance in the development of an acceptable program.

d. If a district determines that it is unable to implement a daily program of physical education for students, the administration shall, with board of education authority, request a waiver. This request shall be forwarded through the regional superintendent to the Director of the Public School Approval Section, Illinois Office of Education.

The area of physical education is alluded to in the Illinois State Board of Education Goals Statement. One of the Learner Goals indicates that "school systems should provide a comprehensive health and safety program to all students".

IV. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The current physical education mandate seems to have evolved from a combination of cultural history, the advocacy of interest groups, and a series of legislative enactments. The first legislative action took place in 1915, with the passage of the Physical Training Act in the 49th General Assembly. In that act, all schools and institutions receiving state support were given the duty of providing courses for not less than one hour each week. By 1927 the Act was revised to mandate physical education for students preparing for the teaching profession.

Due to the lack of physical fitness of inductees into the armed forces during World War II, the Illinois Association of Secondary School Principals recommended that students receive more physical education each week, that hygiene be included, and that standards of preparation for teachers be upgraded. In 1944 legislation was approved, with no opposition, that mandated a minimum of 200 minutes of physical education instruction per week.

In 1957, the physical education law was amended so that mention of recess and lunch periods was removed, and the time requirement of 200 minutes of instruction was revised to require daily instruction. Instruction was to include health as well as physical education. In 1971, the "Critical Health Problems and Comprehensive Health Education Act" (Section 861-866 of The School Code of Illinois) was established. Its purpose was to ensure health education in the schools, and it empowered the state education agency to ensure that requirements of the Act were met. In 1973, legislation (House Bill 937) deleted the health education requirement in the physical education statutes. Thus, physical education and health education were separated and became two distinct subject areas. In reality, this meant more required instructional time for physical education at both the junior and high school level. The statutory requirements for physical education have remained unchanged since 1973.

Federal Law

Public Law 94-142, The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, provides that all handicapped children have available to them a free and appropriate education. A part of the law, Section 121a.307, specifies the necessity of instruction in physical education, specially designed if necessary, at no cost to the parent. No other requirements regarding physical education could be found in federal law.

Attempts to Revise the Physical Education Statutes

Legislation has been introduced during every recent session of the General Assembly to either delete the mandate or to make a variety of modifications. During the 81st and 82nd General Assemblies, ten unsuccessful attempts were made.

During the 81st General Assembly (1979, 1980), the following bills were introduced that would have amended the physical education requirement:

S.B. 028 Would have dropped the daily requirement of physical education in the 11th and 12th grades. The bill was defeated in the Senate Education Committee.

H.B. 436 Would have dropped the daily physical education requirement in the 11th and 12th grades and strengthened the language mandating daily instruction of physical education for students enrolled in state universities engaged in preparing teachers. The bill was tabled in committee.

H.B. 437 This bill was exactly like H.B. 436. It was defeated in the House Education Committee.

H.B. 502 Would have deleted the word "daily" from the current statute. The bill died in the House Education Committee.

H.B. 1293 Would have strengthened the current statute calling for more physical education instruction at all levels. The bill would have continued to prevent driver education instruction from being considered part of the daily physical education requirement. The bill was defeated in the House Education Committee.

During the 82nd General Assembly (1981, 1982), the following bills were introduced that would have amended the statutes:

S.B. 1278 Would have provided for periods of physical education instruction based on grade level. The bill died in the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee.

H.B. 101 Would have allowed students to be excused from physical education for good cause pursuant to a uniform policy adopted by local school boards. The bill was placed on the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee Interim Study Calendar.

H.B. 102 Would have required 200 minutes of physical education instruction each week, with recess periods for three days each week included in the computation for grades K-8. The bill was placed on the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee Interim Study Calendar.

H.B. 656 Would have, as amended, required that students receive physical education instruction for not less than 200 minutes per week, and in no district less time than is presently offered. (Prior to the amendment, the bill would have eliminated daily physical education for students enrolled in public schools and state universities that prepare teachers, would have permitted school boards and universities to

establish their own physical education programs, and would have allowed acceptance of intramural and interscholastic sports as partial fulfillment of the physical education requirements.) The bill failed in the Higher Education Committee.

H.B. 856 Would have allowed special activities or modified courses in physical education where the conditions of students necessitated, as certified by a person licensed to treat human ailments without the use of drugs or operative surgery (currently only by physicians licensed to practice medicine in all its branches). The bill was assigned to the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee Study Calendar.

V. THE INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

The state education agency, through its curriculum materials, has consistently recommended a basic instructional program. As a base for the programs, the desirable course of study has been composed of sequential experiences in a variety of activities such as developmental motor skills, body conditioning, individual sports, gymnastics, dance, team sports, rhythmic activities and aquatics. In many school districts the limitation of proper facilities has substantially affected the breadth of physical education offerings. While there are many excellent programs in the state, most are uneven in quality, and some are directed only toward sports skills.

In 1977, a curriculum committee appointed by the State Superintendent of Education defined physical education as "a planned program of instruction in a variety of movement activities and taught according to the characteristic needs and interests of all children." The emphasis was on specific physical skills designed to produce fitness.

The most recent trend, particularly in elementary school programs, is an emphasis on movement experiences, with physical fitness as the end result. The activities surrounding statewide curricular improvement have been accomplished primarily by the coordinated efforts of the state education agency and the professional organization now called the Illinois Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (IAHPER). A number of schools have established some promising practices. Included among these programs are a wide variety of specific conditioning activities, evaluation and testing procedures, district-community cooperative activities, pre-school development evaluation and co-educational opportunities. Examples of these schools are listed in Reference Section #2.

A national survey of physical education state requirements was conducted in 1981. Of the 46 respondents, 35 required physical education at the elementary level, 38 at the junior high school level, and 40 at the secondary level. In three of the 40 states requiring secondary physical education it was required at only the 9th and 10th grades. The time devoted to physical education varied greatly, but only two states - Illinois and Alabama - specifically required daily instruction for grades K-12. Alabama required a minimum of 30 minutes daily at the elementary level with 50 minutes required daily at the junior high school and secondary level. Two other states, Louisiana and Maine, required time allocations similar to a

daily requirement. Louisiana required 150 minutes per week at the elementary level, 275 minutes at the junior high school level, and 300 minutes in the secondary schools. Maine required a minimum of 20 minutes daily at the elementary level and five 40 minutes periods a week at the secondary level. Eleven states allowed local districts to determine the amount of time to be spent in physical education. In the other states, districts were allowed to determine the time devoted to physical education in accordance with broad state guidelines. Less than one-half of the states required specific program content. In short, with a single exception (Alabama), no other state has a more stringent mandate than Illinois.

Under our mandate, Illinois students spend a significant amount of their available classroom time in physical education. For instance, high school students carrying a normal schedule of classes would spend from 17 to 20% of their class time in physical education. Comparable instructional time requirements exist at the elementary and junior high school level.

The state statutes do not dictate the content of the curriculum, nor is the State Board of Education required or authorized to approve it. The state has issued curriculum materials which are used solely at the discretion of the local district. The State Board of Education School Approval Section monitors physical education by reviewing class schedules during school visitations to determine compliance with the minimum standards of the law. Therefore, recognition status does not necessarily relate to the quality of physical education programs, but only to their existence and the time devoted to them.

The statutory requirements are not being fully implemented in many schools. Supporters and opponents agree that the mandate is being poorly implemented and has resulted in many mediocre programs and, in a number of situations, no programs at all. The following information has been documented.

1. Many districts do not offer daily physical education due to financial and scheduling contraints.

2. During the past decade many schools with grades 1-5 have averaged only two scheduled classes per week; approximately 25% of the high schools do not have a scheduled activity each day of the week.

3. Health, driver education, first aid, recess and/or organized athletics are used as substitutes for physical education instruction in many schools.

A major indicator of the assertion that the current mandate cannot be fully implemented by local districts is the fact that for this mandate alone there are regulatory provisions by which waivers can be granted. This provision came about because many local districts - primarily those with grades K-8 - provided evidence for a number of years that time, personnel and other resources simply were not adequate for full implementation. In the 1976-77 school year approximately 40% of the districts under recognition review were not in compliance with the mandate (208 out of 500); in 1978-79, some 100 waivers were granted.

Subsequently, the number of waivers has been somewhat reduced due to efforts to identify and implement alternative K-8 physical education programs. In 1978 the State Superintendent authorized an ad hoc committee, broadly representative, to study and make recommendations on this particular problem. The committee concluded that daily physical education was a desirable and necessary curricular area and that, in particular, districts with grades K-8 needed help in meeting the mandate. The committee proposed a Pilot Project for elementary classroom teachers that provided an alternative method for compliance. The Pilot Project was approved by the Board. Two booklets of suggested activities for integrating movement activities into the regular elementary classroom subjects were prepared and at least 7000 were distributed. Some local and regional institute sessions and area workshops have included sessions concerning the procedures outlined in the booklet, and some school districts have contracted with consultants for planned inservice programs. Approximately forty districts have implemented the Pilot Project. (See Reference Section, #1)

Data from the 1977 Census of Secondary School Course Offerings show that four-year high schools with less than 2600 enrollment typically offer four courses in physical education, the largest schools offer five. Most schools award one-fourth credit for each year. The most recent enrollment figures show a total of 1,983,463 students - at the elementary level, 1,334,909; at the high school level - 648,554. Of the total enrollment, 73,695 are special education students.

In the 1980-81 school year there were a total of 6,853 full-time physical education teachers (Chicago - 1122; Downstate - 5731), a slight decrease from the total for 1979-80 and other previous school years. Local districts spent $137,557,000 in salaries alone, thus the cost to the state for physical education was substantial.

In reviewing the overall instructional program staff found that local districts are determining the number and content of physical education programs; that programs now tend to be geared toward physical fitness; and that if all of the state's students were involved in programs as required by the current mandate, the effect would be a substantial increase in terms of student time and local and state financial resources.

VI. ANALYSIS OF ISSUES

Staff responded to the five analytical questions as a prelude to developing conclusions and preliminary recommendations. The questions are addressed in turn:

1. What desirable condition or outcome is called for by the mandate?

   Section of 27-7 of The School Code of Illinois, the basis for the mandate, lists eight purposes which could be defined as the desirable outcomes. They are:

   1. To develop organic vigor;
   2. To provide bodily and emotional poise;
   3. To provide neuro-muscular training;
   4. To prevent or correct certain postural defects;
   5. To develop strength and endurance;
   6. To develop desirable moral and social qualities;
   7. To promote hygenic school and home life; and
   8. To secure scientific supervision of the sanitation and safety of school buildings, playgrounds, athletic fields and equipment thereof.

   In practice, though, it appears that physical education programs focus on physical exercise, movement and individual and group sports activities.

   There is a general agreement that the aims specified in the statute far exceed the capability, if not the desirability, of a physical education curriculum to meet them. For example, the mandate states that through physical education, supervision of the sanitation and safety of schools, grounds and equipment are to be assured. The State Board of Education guidelines do not take into consideration this particular element of the statute, nor have schools attempted to achieve this through physical education programs.

   A review of reports from different professional organizations shows that expectations for the physical education mandate are extremely diverse and extensive. A 1974 report of the National Association for Sports and Physical Education states that in addition to "expressing creativity in motion", physical education is "a laboratory of democratic interaction between the individual and the group." The American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance notes that physical education can "help each child become a more self-directed, self-reliant and fully functioning individual."

   In summary, the statutory language implies desirable outcomes for physical education that are extremely broad in scope. By practice, it appears that the desirable outcomes are more narrowly related to physical fitness.

2. Is there any evidence that in the absence of the mandate the condition or outcome will not be achieved?

No, nor is there any evidence that in the presence of the mandate, the desirable aims are being met.

Supporters of mandated physical education argue that high quality programs are essential. They point out the importance of the Surgeon General's Report, which specifies physical activities for children and improving the health of the American people (See Reference Section, #3). The report, however, was not based on data from schools. Supporters cite evidence that removal of the mandate could result in decreased participation in the activity. For instance, since California adopted permissive legislation (1976), there have been fewer students enrolled in physical education classes. According to a 1978 California survey, 95% of the schools have opted to eliminate mandatory physical education for juniors or seniors, or both; there has been an 88% decline in physical education enrollment at the junior and senior levels; and 57% of the high schools have decreased the number of their physical education teachers. At the time this legislation was enacted, the argument was made that due to mandatory physical education, 11th and 12th grade students did not have an opportunity to enroll in courses felt to be more important. It was found that students opted for courses such as art, business and industrial arts when the requirement was changed.

Advocates feel that program cuts are often made first in areas where there are no mandates. They cite examples in other areas of the curriculum in which cutbacks have been made due to the absence of a state statute, such as art and music. Those opposing the mandate say it is highly questionable if districts now offering physical education programs would terminate them if the mandate were eliminated since districts have been conditioned, even in the face of declining resources and increased curricular demands, to attempt to offer some form of physical education. Moreover, local districts strive to provide all programs felt to be important for students, such as English and mathematics, which are not mandated by statute.

Opponents of the mandate argue that there are no data to show that Illinois youth are more physically fit or healthier than children in other states even though Illinois has a very stringent physical education law. The claim is also made that physical education programs alone cannot assure even desired physical fitness outcomes. Many students learn the essential aspects of good health through sources other than the school and acquire/maintain physical fitness through activities outside the physical education curriculum.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' most recent annual report indicates that there is a definite trend toward improved health, that the level of health in the nation is good, that it is getting better for people of all ages, and that increased longevity can be expected. The relationship of physical education to these findings was not addressed.

It may be true that meeting desirable outcomes of physical education is more dependent upon revising the mandate and local programs than it is upon trying to meet the unreasonable array of the indicated outcomes of the current mandate.

3. As presently defined does (can) the mandate yield the desired result?

No. Staff feels that this failure is due mainly to two factors. As presently defined, the outcomes contained in the current mandate are so broad and all encompassing that they are beyond the scope of any single curricular area. Furthermore, the mandated program has not been fully implemented and there are serious questions that it could be implemented in all districts of the state without serious disruption of the total instructional program.

4. Could the mandate be defined and/or implemented differently and yield the desired result?

Yes, with the understanding that a change in the mandate also requires a change in definition of the desired results. Twenty-five years of changes in education and in physical education are not reflected in the present mandate. Efforts to revise the mandate and desirable outcomes should begin with a reappraisal of the basic purposes of physical education.

Various educational groups have suggested specific changes in the law. The Illinois Association of School Administrators has recommended that local districts be allowed to make their own decisions regarding 11th and 12 grade physical education; the Illinois Association of School Boards recommended that recess be included at the elementary level and that health and driver education be a part of the secondary four-year program; the Illinois Congress of Parents and Teachers supports making the senior year requirement optional; and a recent Illinois State Board of Education Student Advisory Committee paper recommended that junior and senior year students should be provided a choice of electing out of physical education for specializing in another academic area.

A redefined mandate with more realistic requirements (1) might bring about improved program quality and effectiveness; (2) would be less cumbersome, and (3) could take into account differences in local districts' capacity to deliver a program.

5. Does the mandate reflect a compelling state interest?

The state has a compelling interest in achieving some of the purposes outlined in the statutes. A physically fit and healthy citizenry contributes much to the economic and social well-being of our state. It may be that the state's interest is less in requiring that all students take physical education and more in requiring that schools provide physical education as needed. However, the specific contribution of mandated daily physical education to this interest finds support mainly in opinion. A cause/effect relationship has not been established, although there are studies which clearly link a program of regular physical exercise to improved health and fitness. Without access to an

appropriate physical education program in the schools, there is a reasonable doubt that all students would develop the attitudes and skills necessary to develop and maintain life-long physical fitness activities which could make a significant contribution to the quality of their lives.

VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Prior to addressing the preliminary recommendations of this staff study it is important to summarize the conclusions drawn as a result of the study and analysis. These conclusions are presented under two headings that encompass the major areas of concern.

Viability of the current mandate

It is concluded that the mandate for physical education, in its current form, is not workable because:

- the purposes required to be addressed by courses in physical education are so broad as to be beyond the capability of a single curriculum area to address them and therefore be accountable for the assessment of their effectiveness;
- the limitations of time, personnel, fiscal and physical resources are such that local districts cannot uniformly meet the requirements of the mandate;
- there is no conclusive evidence of any significant relationship - either positive or negative - between courses in physical education and the physical/motor fitness of students who take them;
- there is no recognition, nor is there latitude for recognition, of the diversity among districts or among students for physical education course needs;
- this is the only program mandate that the state agency has determined requires a waiver provision, based on documentation from local districts that compliance is not possible;
- the time requirements for students are significantly disproportionate to the total amount of instructional time available, particularly in upper secondary grades where students are trying to focus on courses more attuned to their post-high school needs.

State interest in physical education mandate

It is concluded that there is a compelling state interest in having a physically fit citzenry and that there is an appropriate role for schools in helping to meet this interest. The diversity of any district's student population suggests that there will be some students for whom appropriate activities should be required and others for whom appropriate electives should be made available. The distinction, in keeping with the state's interest, should be made at the local level with assurances of state agency assistance as requested and state agency monitoring for compliance.

VIII. PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of this study, the staff recommends that action on the physical education mandate be taken in two parts. These recommended actions are intended to address the appropriateness of a compelling state interest in physical health and fitness and the necessity to define that interest in terms of quality programs most beneficial to the individual student.

Recommendations - Part One

The current mandate should be modified immediately to support the following:

1. That the mandate apply only to students in grades K-10;

2. That the allocation of course time and frequency of the course be determined locally but in keeping with the current statutory language "...compatible with the optimum growth and development needs of individuals at the various age levels" (Code 27-6);

3. That the local district be authorized to stipulate in writing the types of individual student physical education related activities undertaken outside of the school curriculum that would serve as a replacement for required course activity;

4. That districts be required to offer elective physical education courses at grades 11 and 12.

5. That, conditional upon the above items, the current practice of granting waivers be discontinued.

It is further recommended that the Board direct staff to develop amendatory language to the current statutes for consideration by the legislature.

These recommendations are based upon the conclusion that there is sufficient evidence linking physical activity to good health to support a compelling state interest in a mandate and that schools do have a responsibility in this area. They are also based upon the conclusion that both current practices and the current mandate are not specifically directed to either the primary interest of the state in this area or to the particular needs of the students.

Recommendations - Part Two

Upon the passage of legislation consistent with Part I recommendations, the current regulations for physical education should be replaced by ones specifically based upon the state's primary interest in this area. As concluded through this study, the state's interest should be in assuring that schools - to the extent needed - assist students in attaining and maintaining physical fitness. The development of regulations for state and local implementation should take place according to the following:

1. The State Board of Education should authorize the State Superintendent to convene an ad hoc committee with appropriate representation, directed to formulating specific recommendations and submitting its report in January, 1983.

2. The ad hoc committee should be required to address its study and recommendations to the following characteristics:

   a) identification of physical/motor fitness needs of the individual that are compatible with the state's compelling interest and appropriate to the school as a delivery system;

   b) identification of the particular means by which a local district may assess the ability of individual students to meet the stated needs;

   c) identification of the types of physical education curricular activities that could serve those students who are identified as not having the skill level to meet the stated needs.

The development of this report and recommendations will provide the necessary opportunities for the most current research findings and effective program practices to be discussed in a statewide forum. The activities of the study should be beneficial not only to the development of an appropriate state mandate in the area of physical education but also to the improvement in quality in elective programs offered at local initiative.

REFERENCES

1. State Board of Education, Physical Education: A Classroom Teacher's Guide to Instructional Activities, 1980

   This publication discusses some of the contributions and objectives of the elementary physical education programs, the diversity of expectations which the educational world has placed on the field of physical education, and the knowledge and skills required of teachers.

2. The following schools have developed promising practices in their physical education programs:

   Hawthorne Junior High School, Vernon Hills
   Deerfield High School, Deerfield
   Cissna Park Elementary School, Cissna Park
   Washington Junior High School, Naperville
   Homewood-Flossmor High School, Homewood

3. Surgeon General's Report

   Numerous public and private agencies have made commitments to actively engage in activities for the implementation of the National Fitness and Exercise Goals for 1990. Several of these objectives relate to the instructional programs at K-12 levels and state that by 1990, 60 percent of the children should be participating in daily physical education and that procedures for assessing physical fitness and monitoring participation in physical activity should be established.

4. ISBE Student Advisory Council, Physical Education Mandate: A Concept Paper, November 9, 1981

   The Student Advisory Council suggested that mandated physical education should be continued, but that the mandate is in need of review. The Council indicated that the "development needs" of individuals at various age levels must be expanded since at grades 11 and 12 these needs become centered around vocational and college preparation and depriving students of higher academic courses deprives them of opportunity for educational training and advancement.

MMJ:1012g